

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are currently pending in the present application. Claim 5-10 are withdrawn from consideration. No claims are added, canceled, or amended by this amendment.

Claim Rejections under 35 § U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onuki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,231,445, herein Onuki) in view of Kasuya (U.S. Pat. No. 6,473,566, herein Kasuya). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner already admits at pages 3-4 of the current Office Action that Onuki fails to disclose “the image taking optical system is capable of changing a focal length..., wherein the image blurring correction stopping device changes a speed at which the shooting range of the image taking optical system is returned to the reference position according to the focal length of the image taking optical system” as required by claim 1. Instead, the Examiner relies on Kasuya as teaching these features.

Kasuya discloses at col. 7, lines 29-41 “in the microcomputer 9, the amount of movement (amount of correction) in the yaw direction of the image blur correcting optical system 17 is calculated in accordance with a data table calculated in advance by using as parameters the yaw angle signal inputted, the zoom position signal of the zoom optical system 35 for zooming and the focus position signal of the focus lens group 39 that is an optical system for focusing.” However, Kasuya discloses at col. 7, line 66 to col. 8, line 5 “the above-described data table is used and the inputted angle signal in the yaw direction is multiplied by the correction coefficient of the data table to thereby calculate the correction amount of the image blur correcting optical system 17 and output the data to the D/A converter 10 as the position command value of the image blur correcting system 17.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear

Kasuya is using the zoom position signal and the focus position signal for the correction amount of the image blur correcting optical system 17. Accordingly, Kasuya does not disclose that if it is determined the camera is performing a pan or tilt operation “the image blurring correction stopping device changes a speed at which the shooting range of the image taking optical system is returned to the reference position according to the focal length of the image taking optical system” as required by claim 1.

Further, Applicant notes Kasuya also discloses at col. 8 lines 11-56 when the vibration angle of the image taking optical system is represented by θ and the focal length of the zoom optical system is represented by f , the image shift amount ΔY for the infinite object is $\Delta Y = f * \tan \theta$, the maximum image shift amount is $\Delta Y_{MAX} = k * f * \tan \theta_{MAX}$, where θ_{MAX} is the limit value corresponding to the maximum vibration angle within which the image blur may be corrected as the judging level for judging the panning, tilting, or the like is set. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear Kasuya is using the focal length of the zoom optical system only to set a limit value for judging if there is panning or tilting, and Kasuya is not using the focal length of the zoom optical system to change “a speed at which the shooting range of the image taking optical system is returned to the reference position” as required by claim 1.

In particular, Kasuya discloses at col. 6, lines 23-29 “numeral 57 denotes a centering time input member for inputting a period of time for returning the correction optical system 17 back to the standard position in the vicinity of and including the image taking optical axis (a predetermined centering position and the position when the angular shift position that is the output of the integrators 7 and 25 is at zero) in the p[an]ning operation or the tilting operation.” Applicant respectfully submits that Kasuya clearly discloses the period of time for returning the correction optical system 17 to the standard position in the panning or tilting operation is based on the period of time input in the centering time input member 57, and, therefore, Kasuya does

not disclose that if it is determined the camera is performing a pan or tilt operation “the image blurring correction stopping device changes at speed at which the shooting range of the image taking optical system is **returned to the reference position according to the focal length** of the image taking optical system” as required by claim 1. To the contrary, Kasuya discloses at col. 11, lines 25-31 in the panning operation a time period for centering is set in accordance with the input from the centering time input member 57.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is patentable for at least the above reasons. Further, Applicant submits claims 3-4, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNES, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By


Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/AAM: tlt